

THE LANE FALSIFICATION!

Such is Jim Garrison's story. Why then, if he had the necessary proof, did the District Attorney lose his case against Clay Shaw, who was found not guilty? The answer to this reasonable question is not as complex as one might think.

In the first place, with the assassination of Robert Kennedy, the support which he lent to the investigation, ended. That such support was extended, there is no doubt. It is known for instance, that a few weeks before his death Robert Kennedy sent Garrison a letter in which he expressed his conviction that there had been a plot and that Garrison was on the right track. In the same letter Robert Kennedy promised that if he were elected President, the conspiracy would be exposed and the real plotters would be punished.

It was much harder for Garrison to proceed without the support of the Kennedy clan. Shortly after the death of his second brother, Edward Kennedy publicly dissociated himself from the Garrison inquiry. Who could blame him? What was the point of making a target of yourself prematurely?

Secondly, and this is the main point, at the beginning of the Clay Shaw trial in 1969, a considerable part of Garrison's file on the case, including concrete evidence, was stolen. Jim Garrison described the situation in the following somewhat guarded terms, to Henry Borovik, Soviet APN correspondent in the United States:

FROM AN ARTICLE IN SPUTNIK BY
MIKHAIL SAGATELYAN, A WRITER FOR
IZVESTIA.

PRETTY RANCID STUFF - A REHASH
OF DOMESTIC STUFF ALONG THE
FAREWELL AMERICA LINE.

I understand now, looking back, how naive I was two years ago. I had no idea how powerful the CIA was in this country.

We were short-handed. That is why, when people came in and offered their services, we carried out only the most superficial inquiries and if they appeared honest, we availed ourselves of their help. Imagine for yourself — a man comes in and says he's a journalist and even shows us his published, signed articles in various magazines and says: you don't have to tell me anything, you don't have to show me anything, I simply want to help. Well, why not?

We didn't notice right away that these people had connections with each other. To be honest, I was the last one to realise it, because I'm used to trusting people. Afterwards we discovered that the information they provided led off on a tangent. They confused the investigation. They provided false clues and false witnesses.

Besides me, there are only three investigators working in my office. We couldn't tear ourselves into bits. We were given a written statement from a man who was supposed to be living at a certain address, who had a telephone, his name was in the directory, he even had a paid telephone bill in his name. Then it turned out the address and the bill and everything was phony. I somehow never thought then that it was nothing for the CIA to provide their agent with a false telephone bill.

EVERY ASSERTION CAN BE
 TRACED AS PER THE MARK
 LANE "TALE." GARRISON,
 ONE ASSUMES, WAS MAKING
 REFERENCE TO BOXLEY/
 TURNER.

Q PREFER HOME
 BREWED SWILL!

All kinds of people got into the office. One of them must have been a pretty high-ranking agent. Probably he was in charge of the whole operation directed against our investigation. We exposed him a few hours after he began to destroy our files and almost succeeded. The rest of them melted away with him, so they must have been connected. Of course, it's flattering that one of the most powerful agencies in the world — the CIA — was so scared of me, but it's small comfort. Over two years they managed to make off with almost all our files. (Retranslated from the Russian — Tr.)

Now it is clear why Garrison was not simply removed, like scores of others who knew too much about the murder in Dallas. It was much more effective to deprive him of the evidence and destroy his case. That is why the District Attorney hardly bothered to appear in court and the reporters were quite right in concluding that he had lost interest in the Clay Shaw trial.

Now all that remains is to discuss one more outcome of the Garrison investigation, one that is preferably forgotten in America. So, to repeat the question posed at the beginning of this chapter: is the New Orleans District Attorney the Don Quixote of the 20th century?

It would seem so. Jim Garrison's Don Quixotism consisted in the fact that he sincerely believed in the existence of a democracy in his country which would permit

him, according to the letter of the law, to do what he considered essential. That was his biggest mistake. He had the support of powerful forces, he had the support of the general public. But all this was not enough because his opponents held the reins of political power and by their actions they clearly demonstrated that for them — the masters of America — no laws existed, none of the "democratic traditions and principles" of which American propagandists like to boast so much.

It seems that Garrison himself realised this. In any case, this is what he himself wrote:

"What worries me deeply, and I have seen it exemplified in this case, is that we in America are in great danger of slowly evolving into a proto-fascist state. It will be a different kind of fascist state from the one the Germans evolved: theirs grew out of depression and promised bread and work, while ours, curiously enough, seems to be emerging from prosperity. But in the final analysis, it's based on power and on the inability to put human goals and human conscience above the dictates of the state. Its origins can be traced in the tremendous war machine we've built since 1945, the 'military-industrial complex' that Eisenhower vainly warned us about, which now dominates every aspect of our life. The power of the States and Congress has gradually been abandoned to the executive de-